

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/713,008	10/713,008 11/17/2003 Masaaki Ikeda		64517.000002	5744	
21967 HUNTON & V	7590 03/30/2007 VILLIAMS LLP	EXAMINER			
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 1900 K STREET, N.W. SUITE 1200			MAKAR, KIMBERLY A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	N, DC 20006-1109	1636			
			<u></u> .		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/30/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/713,008	IKEDA ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Kimberly A. Makar, Ph.D.	1636		

	Kimberly A. Makar, Ph.D.	1636	•
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 06 March 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, at tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply m	ffidavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expires 5 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7 	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH 06.07(f).	ng date of the final rejection in the FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orion r than three months after the mailing do	t of the fee. The appropri ginally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,	but prior to the date of filing a brief	f will not be entered b	acausa
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NC		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		jected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)			,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-	-
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,2,4,6 and 16-19</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>7-15</u> .			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fai See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attach	ned.
 The request for reconsideration has been considered by <u>See continuation sheet.</u> 	, ,,	in condition for allowa	nce because:
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	David S	luzo
		DAVID GUZO PRIMARY EXAMINE	R

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-2, 4, 6, and 16-19 are rejected under 112 1st scope of enablement. The current claims read on a method of proliferating any terminally differentiated cell either in vivo or in vitro by deliverying a D-type cyclin and the cyclin depedent kinase CDK4 or CDK 6 to the nucleus of the cell, but are only enabled for a method of proliferating cardiomyocytes in vitro by introducing adenoviral vectors expressing a D-type cyclin, CDK4 or CDK6 and a nuclear localization signal. The current amendment, limiting the cell types of the method to cardiomyocytes in claims 1-2, 6, and 16-19 only addresses a portion of the enablement rejection, and does not overcome the rejection regarding the lack of enablement for in vivo methods or using any vector.

Applicants point to the specification and example 5 as an example enabling for in vivo work (see applicant's reponse dated 3/6/07). This example is not enabling for all in vivo work. This method is a sole example of in vivo work where applicant utilizes adenoviral vectors that are injected directly into the apex of a rat heart. Data looking at proliferation marker, Ki-67, was investigated at a single timepoint after 4 days. There is no disclosure of how many cells the adenoviral vector was capable of infecting, if the adenoviral vector only infected cardiomyoctes, how long the proliferation lasted, or any other in vivo model. How many new cells or multinucleated cells were produced in vivo? Thus the lone example is not enabling for all in vivo work.

Applicants also point out that current claim 6 limits the method to adenoviral vectors (see applicant's response dated 3/6/07). This however, does not address the issue of the type of vector used in base claims 1 and 2, which still read on a method for the proliferation of cardiomyocytes using any vector. Applicants only show and teach their method utilizing adenoviral vectors. Thus the claims which are not limited to in vitro work and adenoviral vectors are not in condition for allowance.